

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GEORGI BLAZHEV GARKOV,

Plaintiff,

Case No. C25-90-JHC

V.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

THE PENTAGON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Georgi Blazhev Garkov has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. # 1.) in the above-entitled action. Plaintiff discloses having earned \$5,000.00 in the past twelve months. (Id. at 1.) Plaintiff lists monthly expenses of \$100, which he states are paid for by a United Nations agency. (Id. at 1-2.) Plaintiff reports having no dependents and no valuable property. (Id. at 2.) When asked to provide additional information explaining why he cannot pay court fees and costs, Plaintiff states that he has no source of income. (Id.) Plaintiff did not complete the portion of the application asking for the amount of cash he has on hand and in savings and checking accounts. (See *id.*)

The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed IFP upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigence. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). “To qualify for *in forma pauperis* status,

1 a civil litigant must demonstrate both that the litigant is unable to pay court fees and that the
 2 claims he or she seeks to pursue are not frivolous.” *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, 117 F. App’x 522, 523
 3 (9th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 1051 (2005). To meet the first prong of this test, a litigant
 4 must show that he or she “cannot because of his [or her] poverty pay or give security for the
 5 costs and still be able to provide him[or her]self and dependents with the necessities of life.”
 6 *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948) (internal alterations
 7 omitted).

8 Plaintiff’s application omits information necessary for the Court to determine his ability
 9 to pay court fees and costs. Specifically, Plaintiff does not disclose whether he has available cash
 10 or funds in checking or savings accounts that could be used to pay the \$405.00 filing fee. (See
 11 dkt. # 1 at 2.) Under these circumstances, Plaintiff should not be authorized to proceed IFP.

12 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause by **February 19, 2025**, why this
 13 Court should not recommend his IFP application be denied. Alternatively, Plaintiff may submit
 14 an amended IFP application by that date, explaining his circumstances more fully. The Clerk is
 15 directed to re-note Plaintiff’s IFP application (dkt. # 1) for February 20, 2025, and to send copies
 16 of this order to Plaintiff and to the Honorable John H. Chun.

17 Dated this 15th day of January, 2025.

18 
 19 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
 20 United States Magistrate Judge
 21
 22
 23